

## Evaluation of the PhD thesis in Human Kinetics of Mr. Nicholas Ali (# 5033260) – Chronology

**19-10-2011** – Initial submission of the thesis for evaluation

**Dec. 2011** – Reports (first evaluation):

- E. Lemaire: #3
- M. Labrosse: # 1
- D. Benoît: # 4
- G. Caldwell (external): # 3

**18-01-2012** – Dr. Hastings (interim dean of the FGPS) sent a letter to the student telling him that he has to reregister and revise his thesis during the Winter 2012 session.

**19-04-2012** – Dr. Robertson sends Mr. Ali's comments to Dr. Benoît, who finds them objectionable. Dr. Benoît reports this to Dean Hastings.

**10-05-2012** – The student submits a revised version of his thesis along with a list of comments/changes (117 pages). The list bears his name along with that of his two supervisors.

**14-06-2012** – Dean Hastings emails the student (with a copy to his two supervisors and Vice-Dean Sveistrup) regarding his concerns with the content of the "thesis reviewer sheets". He reminds the student that the thesis is his work and tells him that the names of his supervisors must be removed from the list of comments.

**24-06-2012** – The student responds to the Dean's email, raising some concerns about the choice of two of the evaluators (E. Lemaire and D. Benoît). He enquires about the possibility of adding a second external. He also asks if there is a right of appeal at that stage of the evaluation.

**03-07-2012** – The Dean responds to the email of June 24<sup>th</sup> and informs the student that there is no appeal procedure at that stage of the evaluation. The revised version of the thesis must go through a second evaluation. If the thesis is not accepted for defence at this point, the student will be withdrawn from the program. The withdrawal can be appealed to the Executive Committee of the FGPS and, if the appeal is not granted, to the Senate Appeals Committee.

**05-07-2012** – The student submits a revised list of comments/changes. The student confirms that he wishes this list and his revised thesis to be sent to the evaluation committee.

**13-07-2012** – The Dean acknowledges receipt of the documents and confirms that they will be forwarded to the evaluators. He also informs the student that he continues to have some concerns about the list of comments/changes.

**25-07-2012** – The documents are sent to the evaluation committee.

**07-08-2012** – Dr. Benoît withdraws from the evaluation committee.

**September 2012** – Receipt of the reports for the second evaluation:

- E. Lemaire: #3
- M. Labrosse: # 1
- G. Caldwell (external): # 3

It comes to the attention of the FGPS that the incorrect evaluation form has been sent to the evaluators. They should have received the form entitled: *“Thesis examiner’s report for a revised thesis”* but instead received the form for an initial evaluation entitled: *“Thesis examiner’s report”*. The correct form is sent to the evaluators, with a request to confirm their verdict. The verdicts are as follows:

- E. Lemaire: #3
- M. Labrosse: # 1
- G. Caldwell (external): # 2 (instead of # 3 as originally submitted on 20-09-2012)

The Dean decides to add another external evaluator.

**03-10-2012** – The Dean informs the student and his supervisors that Dr. Benoît has withdrawn and that the thesis will be sent to a second external.

**09-10-2012** – Dr. Robertson suggests the name of Dr. Pierrynowski (who was proposed as a potential external examiner when the list of examiners was initially submitted).

**16-10-2012** – Dr. Pierrynowski agrees to evaluate the thesis.

**18-11-2012** – Dr. Pierrynowski sends his report and gives verdict # 3.

In sum, the verdicts are as follows:

- E. Lemaire: # 3
- M. Labrosse: # 1
- G. Caldwell (external): # 2
- M. Pierrynowski (additional external): # 3

**December 2012** – The student emails Dean Hastings to inform him that some of the articles, which are part of the thesis, have been accepted for publication.

**10-12-2012** – The Dean calls Dr. Pierrynowski to ask if he confirms his verdict that the thesis is not ready for defence. Dr. Pierrynowski confirms this.

**13-12-2012** – The Dean meets with the student and one of his supervisors, Dr. Robertson (the other supervisor is out of the country). The Dean summarizes the evaluations and provides the student and his supervisor with a copy of the evaluation reports. The Dean asks the student to review the reports and provide comments.

The supervisor asks that the thesis go forward to defence as he considers it to be ready. He informs the Dean that 4 papers out of the 5 included in the thesis have been accepted for publication.

**17-12-2012** – Drs. Robertson and Rouhi email Dean Hastings to formally request that the thesis proceed to the defence.

**19-12-2012** – The student sends an email to Dean Hastings to inform him that his supervisors sent their email of 17-12-2012 without consulting him and that he will send his response for the Dean's consideration in due course.

**21-12-2012** – The student sends an email to confirm that he agrees with the request of 17-12-2012 of his supervisors.

**22-12-2012** – The Dean replies that he will render a decision in early January 2013.

**20-01-2013** – The Dean informs the student and his supervisors that he cannot recommend that the thesis go to defence citing FGPS regulation G.5.2 (a) which specifies that "A thesis may not be defended if two examiners are opposed."

**21-01-2013** – Email from Dr. Robertson asking for a confirmation that the two evaluators who gave verdict # 3 considered that the thesis should not proceed to the defence.

**22-01-2013** – Email from the student alleging that Dr. Lemaire did not intend to fail him (the student provides an attachment). The student requests the Dean to change his position and allow the thesis go to defence.

**22-01-2013** – The Dean contacts Dr. Lemaire, who confirms his view that the thesis is not acceptable for defence. The Dean had already contacted Dr. Pierrynowski in December, who also confirmed his verdict.

**24-01-2013** – The Dean re-iterates to the student and his supervisors that the thesis has not been approved for defence.

**26-01-2013** – The student sends an email to raise concerns about the choices of Drs. Lemaire, Pierrynowski and Caldwell as evaluators.

**29-01-2013** – The Dean confirms that his decision has not changed.

**30-01-2013** – Email from the student attaching new documents concerning the choice of Dr. Lemaire as an evaluator.

**30-01-2013** – Email from the Dean to the student: the decision remains the same.

**01-02-2013** – Letter sent via email to the student, with a copy to his supervisors and the evaluation committee confirming the outcome, i.e. that the thesis does not meet the standards for the degree, that his file will be closed and letting him know his appeal options.